# SUPREME COURT MINUTES FRIDAY, DECEMBER 19, 2008 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S040704

PEOPLE v. JOHNSEN (BRIAN DAVID)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Neoma Kenwood's representation that she anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by October 2, 2009, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to February 17, 2009. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 230 additional days are contemplated.

S046848

PEOPLE v. DALTON (KERRY LYN)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Supervising Deputy State Public Defender Denise Anton's representation that she anticipates filing the appellant's reply brief by May 4, 2009, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to February 13, 2009. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 80 additional days are contemplated.

S051342

**PEOPLE v. CUNNINGHAM** (JOHN)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Brian A. Pori's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's reply brief by December 15, 2009, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to February 13, 2009. After that date, only five further extensions totaling about 300 additional days are contemplated.

S062259

PEOPLE v. SCULLY (ROBERT WALTER)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Supervising Deputy State Public Defender Margot Garey's representation that she anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by March 2010, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to February 23, 2009. After that date, only seven further extensions totaling about 390 additional days are contemplated.

## S084996

PEOPLE v. CHHOUN (RUN PETER)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon Senior Deputy State Public Defender Susan Ten Kwan's representation that she anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by October 2009, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to February 17, 2009. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 240 additional days are contemplated.

S090499

PEOPLE v. LIVINGSTON (DAVID JAMES)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Robert Wayne Gehring's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by June 30, 2009, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to February 13, 2009. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 140 additional days are contemplated.

S094890

PEOPLE v. MANIBUSAN (JOSEPH KEKOA)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel David S. Adams's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by June 2010, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to February 23, 2009. After that date, only eight further extensions totaling about 480 additional days are contemplated.

S097414

PEOPLE v. KOPATZ (KIM RAYMOND)

Extension of time granted

On application of appellant and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file appellant's opening brief is extended to February 17, 2009.

S103087

PEOPLE v. POST (JOHN)

Extension of time granted

Good cause appearing, and based upon counsel Ralph H. Goldsen's representation that he anticipates filing the appellant's opening brief by June 15, 2009, counsel's request for an extension of time in which to file that brief is granted to February 13, 2009. After that date, only two further extensions totaling about 120 additional days are contemplated.

**S161008** B188718 Second Appellate District, Div. 8

VILLAGE NORTHRIDGE HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION v. STATE FARM FIRE & CASUALTY COMPANY

Extension of time granted

On application of respondent and good cause appearing, it is ordered that the time to serve and file the answer to amicus curiae brief is extended to January 16, 2009.

S132256

PEOPLE v. HELZER (GLEN TAYLOR)

Counsel appointment order filed

In California, a criminal defendant has no right to represent himself or herself on appeal. (*People v. Scott* (1998) 64 Cal.App.4th 550; see also *Martinez v. California* (2000) 528 U.S. 152.) On the court's own motion, Jeanne Keevan-Lynch is hereby appointed to represent appellant Glen Taylor Helzer for the direct appeal in the above automatic appeal now pending in this court.

S168915

POLK (SUSAN MAE) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

Transferred to Court of Appeal, First Appellate District

The above entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition must be denied.

S168921

SMITH (JAMES E.) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District

The above entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition must be denied.

## S169022

# PEOPLE v. S.C. (ETTLIN)

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District

The above entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition must be denied.

# S169070

ELDRIDGE (JOHN) v. S.C. (PEOPLE)

Transferred to Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District

The above entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Fifth Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition must be denied.

### S156899

#### **CENTERS ON DISCIPLINE**

Probation revoked

Good cause having been shown, it is hereby ordered that probation is revoked, the previously ordered stay of execution of suspension in the above entitled matter is lifted, and JUDITH A. CENTERS, State Bar No. 150247, must be actually suspended from the practice of law for one year and until she makes restitution to Davida Oberman in the amount of \$45,133.13 plus 10 percent interest per annum from May 25, 2005 (or to the Client Security Fund to the extent of any payment from the fund to Davida Oberman, plus interest and costs, in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6140.5), and furnishes satisfactory proof thereof to the State Bar's Office of Probation in Los Angeles. If respondent is actually suspended for two years or more, she must remain actually suspended until she provides proof to the satisfaction of the State Bar Court of her rehabilitation, fitness to practice and learning and ability in the general law pursuant to standard 1.4(c)(ii) of the Standards for Attorney Sanctions for Professional Misconduct. Credit toward the period of actual suspension must be given for the period of involuntary inactive enrollment which commenced on September 26, 2008 (Business and Professions Code section 6007(d)(3)). It is further ordered that respondent comply with rule 9.20 of the California Rules of Court, and that she perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the effective date of this order.\* Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business and Professions Code section 6086.10 and are enforceable both as provided in Business and Professions Code section 6140.7 and as a money judgment. \*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)